



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

gist, particularly if he be concerned especially with Melanesia, Polynesia, or Africa. Any theory of the connection of the divination rites of the natives of Borneo and those of ancient Rome will have to take account of this fairly wide distribution of similar and related things in the world of savagery. The historical hiatus must be bridged by data that show the probability of actual contact between the two in the past.

[NOTE.—An interesting paper on "The Liver as the Seat of the Soul," by Professor Morris Jastrow, is published in *Essays Dedicated to Dr. Foy*. In this connection reference should be made to the recent publication of Leo Frobenius, *Und A frika Sprach* (Berlin: Ch. Vita, Deutsches Verlagshaus), in which that writer, basing his arguments partly on similar practices of divination, supposes contact between Yoruba and the ancient Etruscans.]

W. D. WALLIS

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### THE PARTING OF HECTOR AND ANDROMACHE

The parting of Hector and Andromache as pictured in the sixth book of the *Iliad* is regarded by lay readers as the greatest triumph of Homer's genius, but by many of the critics it is rejected as a late intruder which destroys the harmony and effect of the whole. The defects of this scene, as it now stands, have been pointed out with great detail by Naber, *Quaestiones Homericae*, Amsterdam 1877; Bethe, *Hektors Abschied*, Leipzig, 1909, and by Van Leeuwen in the *Mnemosyne*, 1910, 339 ff. That this parting came so late in the story is not seriously pressed, but that it is not indeed the last farewell seems to these scholars as a supreme poetic absurdity. Hector, according to the accepted text of the *Iliad*, returned at the end of this day's fighting to his home and his wife, that is, he spent the night after the parting, the night after the first day's fighting, presumably the twenty-second day in the story of the *Iliad*, in the city, and he seems to have been in Troy most of the two following days and nights. The success of the Trojans in the second day's fighting, the twenty-fifth day of the *Iliad*, induces him to encamp near the place of combat and to remain in the plain outside the walls. On the following day Patroclus is slain and Achilles is kept from fighting until his mother can bring him new arms. Hector spurns the wise advice of Polydamas to return within the walls, remains that night in the plain, and on the following day falls by the hand of Achilles. Thus Hector is slain on the twenty-seventh day of the action of the *Iliad*, or five days after the scene of parting. Of the five intervening nights three seem to have been spent in the city, presumably with his wife and son, and two outside the walls not far from the camp of the Greeks.

No doubt every reader is a little surprised to find that Hector and Andromache meet again after this scene of parting. Bethe sees in this account a contamination of two independent traditions and repeatedly asserts that Hector's death must have followed close upon his departure from his wife:

"Gehört sie [the parting] doch unmittelbar vor Hektors Tod" (p. 413); "Hektor wird nicht wiederkehren, Hektor geht seinen Todesgang" (p. 427).

Van Leeuwen paints in darkest colors the poetic monstrosity of having Hector meet his wife and child again: "Non epos sed satyricum aliquod drama vel comoediam tenere nos credimus, si Hector sub vesperam redux ad Andromachen," etc., *Mne.*, 1910, p. 338. As Van Leeuwen has now become one of the most ardent defenders of Homeric unity he does not try to reject this scene nor to transpose it, but with that deftness for which he and his countrymen are justly famous he rewrites the few verses where it is implied that Hector returned to the city at the end of the first day's fighting, and leaves him outside of the walls with his soldiers. Hector and his wife thus do not meet again, the great scene of the parting is saved to the *Iliad*, Homer is once more a true poet, and his poem is neither a farce nor a comedy!

The two charges which may justly be brought against this scene are, first, it should have come earlier in the war and not after ten years of fighting, and, second, the tone of the parting seems to imply that they will not meet again.

Shakespeare, in the advice of Polonius given to Laertes, offers a perfect parallel to the first charge. Laertes has already been long in France whence he has returned to Denmark to be present at the coronation, yet when he is on the point of going back his father tells him how to dress in France and adds many details of conduct, as if he were indeed leaving Denmark for the first time. No doubt this scene from *Hamlet* might have better suited that first home-leaving of Laertes, but as that fell outside the limits of the poem the poet must either insert it here or omit it altogether. Homer also, since he did not describe the earlier years of the war, must put this scene in the only part which falls to his poem, that is the tenth year.

This is only a trifling matter, and the real difficulty lies in the fact that this solemn parting is for a few hours only, while the real and final farewell is passed over in silence. Is this true to the highest and best standards of poetry? There is no truth in poetry which is not also truth in life. Are there any parallels to this in life and in literature? Surely no husband and father ever went to dangerous battle without some such a farewell as this, and the pathos of the parting was not changed by the accident that he may have returned while many of his companions fell. From a mass of parallels I select one which is so striking that it must carry its own conviction. The first person in the narrative of the Bible to prepare for death by giving his final blessing to his son and successor was Isaac.

Gen. 27: 1. And it came to pass that when Isaac was old, and his eyes were dim, so that he could not see, he called Esau his eldest son, and said unto him, My son: and he said unto him, Behold here am I.

2. And he said, Behold now, I am old, I know not the day of my death;

3. Now therefore take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out to the field, and take me some venison;

4. And make me some savoury meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die.

Not only does Isaac feel that the end of life is at hand, but Rebekah shares in his fears and urges Jacob to make haste and to anticipate his brother in bringing the meat to his father and in securing the blessing:

10. And thou shalt bring it to thy father, that he may eat, and that he may bless thee before he dies. [Words of Rebekah.]

After Isaac has blessed his son and successor and brought manifest strife into his family he should have died and thus justified his own fears and those of his wife, but no such tradition of his death has been preserved. According to the biblical account he was still alive when Jacob returned from serving Laban. This story of Isaac and his abortive blessing was no farce and no comedy, but in the eyes of the final compiler of the Book of Genesis was a story from real life. Whether the story of Isaac be an actual fact or not, it was at least regarded as such by the compilers and preservers of the narrative.

It was no more necessary that Hector's fears should have been immediately fulfilled than that Isaac's blessing should at once have been followed by his death.

When Hector left his wife on the morning of that first day's fighting he hoped to settle the conflict without actual warfare, and accordingly proposes and arranges the duel between Paris and Menelaus with the accompanying truce. The outcome of that duel and the breaking of the truce fill him with grief and dismay, he has no wish and no heart to fight and hence when he first appears on the scene of fighting he is in flight, nor does he indeed take any hand in the struggle until Sarpedon severely reproaches him for his cowardice and for his abandoning the allies and their interests. This touches his sense of honor and he, with evident reluctance, joins in the struggle. In order to appease the gods for the outrage of the broken oath he returns to the city to urge the women to make a general supplication for the favor of Athena. He has no heart in the cause but feels that his people and his city are already doomed. Nothing could more pathetically describe his despair than the fact that he uses the very words which Agamemnon had already uttered in regard to the perfidy of the broken oath.

εὖ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε οἶδα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν·  
ἔσσεται ἡμῶν ὅτ' ἂν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρὴ  
καὶ Πριάμος καὶ λαὸς ἐνυμελίῳ Πριάμοιο.

Hector does not himself connect these words directly with the broken oath, but every hearer must have remembered the words of Agamemnon and made his own application and drawn his own inference.

A great danger awaits Hector outside the walls; he feels that he has no just grounds for trusting in the support of the gods and that he is going out to a hopeless struggle. Andromache shares in these forebodings. The fact that Hector was not immediately slain changes in no particular the gloom, the pathos, or the tenderness of this parting scene. After Hector had left his wife and met Paris the natural reaction set in and he told Paris what they would

do when finally they are rid of the Greeks. Here he was mistaken, for he never lived to "drink a cup of freedom in his halls."

When Socrates was condemned to death he said to those who condemned him, "I wish to foretell the future to you, for I am now at that point where men especially prophesy, when they are about to die." He then predicted certain things would happen which never came to pass. The signal failure of this prophecy changed in no particular the impressiveness or solemnity of the utterance.

We can demand only of a poet that he be true to life. In real life no noble and discouraged father ever left his family for a scene of imminent danger without some such parting as the farewell pictured by Homer. Whether or not it is to be in truth the final parting cannot then be foreseen.

Would the grief of Penelope during those twenty years have been more bitter if at the end Odysseus had not returned? We can look at the outcome and anticipate sorrow or comfort thereby, but Penelope, Hector, and Andromache could not. The poet chose to paint their feelings rather than ours. This, it seems to me, is the essence of the whole matter: the poet preferred to picture the emotions of the actual participants in the action of the poem rather than those of the hearer or reader.

All that this scene needs as a background is the presence of an immediate and unusual danger, a brave and discouraged husband, and a loving and solicitous wife. These we have in Homer and any change in this scene or in its setting must be at the expense of poetic beauty and poetic truth.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

---

### ROBERT BROWNING AND ALCIPHRON

Readers of Browning need not be told that he was well read in Greek; but I think no one has called attention to the contribution of Alciphron to certain passages in *Balaustion's Adventure*, the narrative which introduces the English poet's "transcript" of the *Alcestis* of Euripides. The fact is of interest because it illustrates the range of Browning's reading and his ability to find the materials for spirited verse in some of the more arid and neglected portions of ancient literature.

At least three of the names of the four girls in Balaustion's imagined audience are taken from the letters of Alciphron. She calls them Petale, Phullis, Charope, Chrusion. Megara writes to Bacchis (*Alc.* i. 39. 2):

πάσαι παρήμεν, Θεττάλη, Μοσχάριον, Θαίς, Ανθράκιον, Πετάλη, Θρηναλλίς, Μυρρίνη, Χρύσιον, Ζευξίπη

Another letter is addressed by Glaucippe to Charope (iii. 1). The name Phullis is more likely than the others to have occurred to the poet without reference to any specific source, but it also is found in the heading of a letter (iii. 16).